

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Claim Objections

2. The following claims are objected to for the listed reasons:
 - a. Claim 2: "the second XML string", lack of antecedent basis
 - b. Claim 3: "the distributed access system" and "the renderer" , lack of antecedent basis
 - c. Claim 12: "the business object" , lack of antecedent basis
 - d. Claim 5, "cutomer", typo

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-4 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kittredge et al., US 7,103,627 (hereinafter Kittredge).

For claim 1, Kittredge discloses a method for call center processing (Abstract), the method comprising:

providing a call center system (col.10, lines 16-22), wherein the call center system includes:

a business object function, wherein the business object function is implemented in a script language (Inherent in disclosure that web browser formats, i.e. manipulates user inputted data into ordered formatting; as well, client-side scripting is well-known in web browsing); and

a communication layer col. 9, lines 24-30);

receiving a data set (col. 8, lines 57-62);

applying the business object function to the data set, wherein the business object function creates a business object (Inherent in disclosure that web browser formats, i.e. manipulates user inputted data into ordered formatting);

applying the communication layer to the business object, wherein the business object is converted to an XML string (col. 9, lines 24-31); and

transmitting the XML string to a server, wherein a remote function is applied to the XML string (col. 9, lines 24-31 and col. 8, line 57-col. 9, line 10).

For claim 2, Kittredge discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the business object is a first business object, wherein the XML string is a first XML string (col. 9, lines 24-31, disclosure of interchange of XML strings between clients and web server), and wherein the method further comprises:

receiving the second XML string, wherein the second XML string represents the first business object after application of the remote function (col. 9, lines 24-31 and col. 8, line 57-col. 9, line 10); and

converting the second XML string to a second business object (col. 11, lines 44-50, disclosure of client displaying XML string from server as result of client making request to web server).

For claim 3, Kittredge discloses the method of claim 2, wherein the distributed access system further includes a renderer (col. 8, lines 43-46), and wherein the method further comprises:

providing the second business object to the renderer (col. 11, lines 44-50) ; and
rendering and displaying the second business object. (col. 11, lines 44-50)

For claim 4, Kittredge discloses the method of claim 3, wherein the renderer is an incremental renderer (col. 9, lines 31-35, disclosure of DHTML technology and col. 10, lines 35, disclosure of java applets, which also allows for incremental updating of information presented to user).

For claim 8, Kittredge discloses a system for call center processing in a distributed environment (Abstract), the method comprising:

a distributed access system (Kittredge, col. 8, lines 57-61), wherein the distributed access system includes:

a renderer (col. 8, lines 43-46);

a business object function, wherein the business object function is operable to form a business object based on an information input, and wherein the business object function is implemented in a script language (Inherent in disclosure that web browser format user inputted data into ordered formatting; as well, client-side scripting is well-known in art; Kittredge, col. 8, lines 57-62); and

a communication layer, wherein the communication layer is operable to form the business object into an XML string (Kittredge, col. 9, lines 24-31).

For claim 9, Kittredge discloses the system of claim 8, wherein the XML string is a first XML string (Kittredge, col. 9, lines 24-31), and wherein the communication layer is further operable to:

distribute the first XML string to a remote server, wherein the remote server performs a remote function (Kittredge, col. 9, lines 24-31 and col. 8, line 57-col. 9, line 10); and

receive a second XML string, wherein the second XML string represents the first XML string after application of the remote function (Kittredge, col. 9, lines 24-31 and col. 8, line 57-col. 9, line 10).

For claim 10, Kittredge discloses the system of claim 9, wherein the business object is a first business object (col. 9, lines 24-31), and wherein the business object function is operable to:

receive the second XML string from the communication layer col. 9, lines 24-31 and col. 8, line 57-col. 9, line 10),

convert the second XML string to a second business object (col. 11, lines 44-50).

For claim 11, Kittredge discloses the system of claim 10, wherein the renderer is operable to render the second business object for display (col. 11, lines 44-50).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kittredge, in view of Rush et al., US 6,981,222 (hereinafter Rush).

For claim 5, Kittredge fails to explicitly disclose wherein the business object function is selected from a group consisting of: an order entry, a customer, an item, an order fulfillment, and an order status.

However, Rush discloses a method wherein client object functions include determining an order status (col. 11, lines 25-42). Kittredge and Rush are analogous art because both are from the field of client/server querying.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Kittredge with the teachings of Rush, because this modification allows the generalized client/server web system taught by Kittredge to include functionality for a call center application.

For claim 6, the combination of Kittredge and Rush discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the remote function is selected from a group consisting of: an order status update, an order fulfillment, a premium fulfillment, and a marketing access (Rush, col. 11, lines 25-42 and col. 12, line 59-67).

7. Claims 7, 12-14 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kittredge, in view of Roberts et al., US 6,295,551 (hereinafter Roberts).

For claim 7, Kittredge fails to explicitly disclose wherein the method further comprises:
requesting the business object function; and

receiving the business object function via the Internet.

However, Roberts discloses a method wherein a server provides additional functionality to a client on as-needed basis. (col. 9, line 39-col. 10, line 4). Kittredge and Roberts are analogous art because both are from the field of client/server querying.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Kittredge with the teachings of Roberts, because this modification allows the generalized client/server web system taught by Kittredge to provide additional functionality to a client to complete a user's request.

For claim 12, Kittredge discloses a method for call center processing (Abstract), the method comprising:

providing a call center application, wherein the call center application is executable within a Internet browser environment (col.10, lines 16-22);

receiving an access request, wherein the access request is received via the Internet browser environment, wherein the access request indicates a class of activities (col. 8, lines 57-62); and

based at least in part on the request, wherein the business object function performs a function within the class of activities (Inherent in disclosure that web browser formats user inputted data into ordered formatting), and wherein the business object function is executable within the Interact browser environment (col. 8, lines 43-46).

Kittredge fails to explicitly disclose the portion of the third limitation "distributing a business object function" and "wherein the business object is accessible via the call center application:

However, Roberts discloses a method wherein a server provides additional functionality to a client on as-needed basis. (col. 9, line 39-col. 10, line 4). Kittredge and Roberts are analogous art because both are from the field of client/server querying.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Kittredge with the teachings of Roberts, because this modification allows the generalized client/server web system taught by Kittredge to provide additional functionality to a client to complete a user's request.

For claim 13, the combination of Kittredge and Roberts discloses the method of claim 12, wherein the method further includes:

receiving a business object XML string, wherein the business object XML string is an XML string representation of a business object generated by the business object function (Kittredge, col. 9, lines 24-31 and col. 8, line 57-col. 9, line 10).

For claim 14, the combination of Kittredge and Roberts discloses the method of claim 13, wherein the business object XML string is a first business object XML string (Kittredge, col. 9, lines 24-31), and wherein the method further includes:

performing a remote function on the first business object XML string, wherein the function provides a business object output (Kittredge, col. 9, lines 24-31 and col. 8, line 57-col. 9, line 10); and

transmitting the business object output as a second business object XML string to the Internet environment (Kittredge, col. 9, lines 24-31 and col. 8, line 57-col. 9, line 10).

For claim 18, the combination of Kittredge and Roberts discloses the method of claim 12, wherein the business object function is implemented in a script language (Inherent in disclosure that web browser formats, i.e. manipulates user inputted data into ordered formatting; as well, client-side scripting is well-known in web browsing).

For claim 19, Kittredge discloses the method of claim 18, wherein the script language is a Jscript language (Inherent in disclosure that web browser formats, i.e. manipulates user inputted data into ordered formatting; as well, client-side scripting, particularly Jscript, is well-known in web browsing).

For claim 20, the combination of Kittredge and Roberts discloses the method of claim 18, wherein the method further includes: converting the business object from script language to an XML string for transmission to the Internet browser environment (Kittredge, col. 9, lines 24-31 and col. 8, line 57-col. 9, line 10).

6. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kittredge, in view of Roberts, and further in view of Rush.

For claim 15, the combination of Kittredge and Roberts fails to explicitly disclose wherein the remote function is selected from a group consisting of: an order status update, an order fulfillment, a premium fulfillment, a marketing access

However, Rush discloses a method wherein client object functions include determining an order status (col. 11, lines 25-42). Kittredge, Roberts and Rush are analogous art because all are from the field of client/server querying.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of the combination of Kittredge and Roberts with the teachings of Rush, because this modification allows the generalized client/server web system taught by Kittredge to include functionality for a call center application.

For claim 16, the combination of Kittredge, Roberts and Rush discloses the method of claim 12, wherein the class of activities includes an order entry class of activities (Kittredge, col. 8, lines 57-62).

For claim 17, the combination of Kittredge, Roberts and Rush discloses the method of claim 16, wherein order entry class of activities includes a business object function selected from a group consisting of: a product information display, a product comparison display, a tax calculation, a shipping calculation, a delivery specification, a

customer detail function, and a custom product specification (Rush, col. 11, lines 25-42; Rush col. 12, line 59-col. 13, line 67; Rush, col. 15, lines 1-16.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clayton R. Williams whose telephone number is 571-270-3801. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8 a.m. - 5 p.m.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2157

/Ario Etienne/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157